

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Aho. As applied to the claims as amended, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, for at least the reasons detailed below.

Claim 1 has been amended to further include features of now-cancelled claim 2 including, at least, the feature of reading out from a language-specific-rule table at least one of one or more language-specific-information analyzing functions that are needed for analyzing program code, and the feature that one or more predetermined rules are stored in the language-specific-rule table as one or more language-specific-information analyzing functions. Applicants respectfully submit that Aho neither teaches nor suggests at least these features.

Though the Office Action cites a “lookup” operation on page 478 of Aho as showing reading out from a language-specific-rule table, this “lookup” table is actually a symbol table, which, as explained on page 11 of Aho, is a data structure containing a record for a number of identifiers with fields for the attributes of each identifier. As further explained on page 12, the compiler’s internal representation of the source program changes as the translation progresses. During translation, when a particular identifier is used, the “lookup” operation checks to see if there is an entry for this occurrence of the identifier name in the symbol table.

Furthermore, while the Office Action cites the “type checking” feature of determining values or relationships included in a program code as being the same as step (e), the symbol table is also cited for the lookup operation of step (d). This appears inconsistent according to the features defined in step (e).

Accordingly, it appears that the table during the “lookup” operation of Aho actually is a symbol table created during the compiling process, and Aho does not appear to disclose a language-specific-rule table containing one or more predetermined rules as one or more language specific information analyzing functions. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that at least these features are neither taught nor suggested by Aho.

Additionally, Applicants have further amended claim 1 to include features of now cancelled claim 3, including, among other features, a check function table having language-specific-information analyzing functions that are read out in step (d). Applicants respectfully submit that at least this additional feature does not appear to be disclosed or suggested by Aho. Regarding the check function substep (f) from which the analyzing functions are to be read out in step (d), the Office Action cites page 348 of Aho disclosing a type checker, which is a translation scheme that synthesizes the type of each expression. This type checker establishes relationships with particular identifiers, and indicates an error if an assignment statement is incorrect. However, this is not the same thing as the language-specific-rule table defined in amended claim 1. While the type checker can apparently be used to create the symbol table, it does not appear that the symbol table is itself a language-

specific-rule table with one or more predetermined rules as language specific information analyzing functions.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 as amended is allowable over the references of record, including Aho. Claims 4 (amended to depend from amended claim 1), 5, and 6, being dependent from amended claim 1, are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons stated above as applied to claim 1, plus additional reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Applicants have amended independent claim 7 to further include features of now cancelled claims 8 and 9. As applied to claim 7 as amended, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the reason that Aho neither discloses nor suggests, among other features, the feature of a readout unit which reads out, from a language-specific-rule table, at least one or more language-specific-information analyzing functions which is needed for analyzing a program code, the feature wherein the language-specific-rule table stores one or more predetermined rules as one or more language-specific-information analyzing functions, nor the feature of a check function table in which at least one of one or more language-specific-information analyzing functions read out by the readout unit is registered for use by a determination unit. Applicants respectfully submit that at least these features are absent in Aho for at least the reasons described above regarding similar features in amended claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 as amended, and dependent claims 10 (amended to depend from amended claim 7) and 11-12, are allowable over the references of record, including Aho. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Independent claim 13 has been amended to further include features of now-cancelled claim 14, including at least the feature that the language-specific-rule table stores one or more predetermined rules as one or more language-specific-information analyzing functions, and the feature that the analyzing unit comprises a readout unit which reads out from the language-specific-rule table at least one of one or more language-specific-information analyzing functions which is needed for analyzing the program code. Applicants respectfully submit that these features, among other features, are neither disclosed nor suggested by Aho for at least the reasons stated above as applied to similar features of amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 13 as amended, as well as dependent claims 15 and 16, are allowable, and thus request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.


Applicants have amended independent claim 17 to further include features of now-cancelled claim 18, including at least the feature that the language-specific-rule table stores one or more predetermined rules as one or more language-specific-information analyzing functions, and the feature that the analyzing unit comprises a readout unit which reads out from the language-specific-rule table at least one of one or more language-specific-

information analyzing functions which is needed for analyzing an intermediate code. Applicants respectfully submit that Aho neither teaches nor suggests a language-specific-rule table or the readout unit defined in amended claim 17 for similar reasons as to that described above regarding similar features of amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17 is allowable over the references of record, including Aho, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Applicants have amended independent claim 19 to further include features of now-cancelled claim 20, including at least the feature that the language-specific-rule table stores one or more predetermined rules as one or more language-specific-information analyzing functions, and the feature that the analyzing unit includes a readout unit which reads out from the language-specific-rule table at least one of the one or more language-specific-information analyzing functions which is needed for analyzing source code. Applicants respectfully submit that Aho neither teaches nor suggests at least these additional features for at least the reasons described above regarding similar features of amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 19 is allowable over the references of record, including Aho, and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner should call Applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,
GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 
Arik B. Ranson
Registration No. 43,874

June 24, 2003
300 S. Wacker Drive - Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6501
Telephone: (312) 360-0080
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315
Customer No. 24978
K:\0828\64472\amendment A.DOC